

the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-20 and 22-24 have been rejected as being anticipated by Viloet et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that

"Viloet et al. discloses a method of processing calls in an automatic call distributor (Fig. 1), such method comprising the steps of: learning a set of desired resource relationships for servicing a plurality of call processing load conditions in the automatic call distributor (column 4, lines 53-58); and distributing resources of the automatic call distributor based upon call processor loading and the learned set of resource relationships (column 4, lines 32-52)".

It is noted first, that the claims are directed to the method step of (and apparatus for) "learning a set of desired resource relationships for servicing a plurality of call processing load conditions in an automatic call distributor". It is noted next, that Viloet is not a neural network and is, therefore, not capable of learning. For example, FIG. 1 of the Specification shows (and the text of the Specification describes) a neural network 32 disposed within a host computer 16. As is well known to those of skill in the art, a neural network computer is "A very different kind of computer . . . Neural network computers are build from webs of randomly connected electronic neurons . . . These machines are designed to be trained, not programmed" (Newton's Telecomm Dictionary, 15th Ed., page 538, copy attached). In contrast, under Viloet "The call pacing algorithm is a set of software routines comprising a program executing on the tandem

computer 34 which provides instructions to the automatic call distributor 12" (Vilaset, col. 4, lines 53-56).

A person of skill in the art would clearly recognize that a program executing on a computer is a static structure that operates strictly within a set of programming boundaries and which can only be changed by reprogramming. In contrast, under the invention, "the user may be prompted to identify a database within the host 16, which may be used to train each NN 32" (Specification, page 13, lines 30-32). Since the Vilaset system is programmed, not trained, it does not do exactly the same thing in exactly the same way. Since Vilaset does not do exactly the same thing in exactly the same way, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Claims 3, 12 and 21 have been rejected as being obvious over Vilaset et al. in view of Corduroy et al. However, Corduroy et al., as with Vilaset et al., fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of learning or of neural networks. Since neither Vilaset et al. or Corduroy et al. teach or suggest learning or neural networks, the combination fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Since the combination fails to teach each and every element as required by MPEP §2143.03, the prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. Since the prima facie case has not been made, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Allowance of claims 1-24, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the

subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By



Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

January 19, 2001
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500